



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/724,170

12/01/2003

Maureen Caudill

000479.00114

9385

22907 7590 05/14/2008

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1200

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER

MYINT, DENNIS Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Applicant's Appeal Brief, filed on February 2, 2008.
2. This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 81 in line 1 recites "one or more computer readable media", claim 87 in line 1 recites "one or more computer readable media", and claim 93 in line 1 recites "one or more computer readable media". However, the specification of the instant application fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the limitation "one or more computer readable media".

Duplicate Claims Objections

4. Claim 87 is objected under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 81. Claim 88 is objected under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 82. Claim 89 is objected under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 83. Claim 90 is objected under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 84. Claim 91 is objected under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 85. Claim 92 is objected under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim

86. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 81-99 are allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections made above under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and 37 CFR 1.75. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter.

As per claim 81, Maarek et al. (hereinafter "Maarek") ("Ephemeral Document Clustering for Web Applications", IBM Research Report, RJ 10186, April 2000) in view of Call (hereinafter "Call")(U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0143521) is directed to one or more computer readable media storing computer executable instructions to perform a method for vectorizing a set of document structures.

However, Maarek in vie of Call does not explicitly teach the limitations: "document predicate structures", "identifying one predicate and argument in said document predicate structures" and "a predicate key that is an integer representation"

As per claim 87, Maarek in vie of Call is directed to one or more computer readable media storing computer executable instructions to perform a method for vectorizing a set of document structures.

However, Maarek in view of Call does not explicitly teach the limitations: “document predicate structures”, “identifying one predicate and argument in said document predicate structures” and “a predicate key that is an integer representation”.

As per claim 93, Maarek in view of Call is directed to one or more computer readable media storing computer executable instructions to perform a method for constructing vector representations for each of a set of document.

However, Maarek in view of Call does not explicitly teach the limitations: “predicate structures”, “identifying the predicate and the at least one argument in each of M predicate structures” and “a predicate key that is an integer representation”.

The dependent claims, being definite, further limiting, and fully enabled by the section are also allowable.

6. Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213, (Comm’r Pat. 1935).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is (571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-5629.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dennis Myint
Examiner
AU-2162

/John Breene/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2162